

Remarks

Claim 31 has been amended to properly depend on Claim 20.

Applicant respectively traverses the restriction requirement.

In the communication, it has been asserted that two separate inventions are being claimed, i.e., the invention of Group I drawn to a receptacle on a support frame, recited in claims 1 through 19, and the invention of Group II drawn to a lower roll for a conveyor having an axis, a belt and a moldboard pivotal about the axis of the lower roll, recited in claims 20 through 31. With respect to such assertion, it respectfully is submitted that only a single invention is being claimed in such claims as a comparison of the elements of the two different groups of patents indicate. Referring to independent claims 1 and 20, it will be noted that each of such claims defines a machine including a wheel unit, a support frame with means for advancing the machine, a conveyor disclosed on the support means for gathering articles on the ground, a moldboard and means for driving the conveyor. Independent claim 1 differs from independent claim 20 only with respect to reciting an additional element, i.e., a receptacle for receiving articles gathered by the endless conveyor. Accordingly, it is submitted that only a single invention is being claimed and that the restriction requirement should be withdrawn.

In compliance with the Rules of Practice, Applicant provisionally elects to prosecute the invention of Group I as recited in claims 1 through 19.

In view of the foregoing, it respectfully is requested that the restriction requirement be withdrawn and that the application be advanced to an examination on the merits.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter N. Lalos

Registration No. 19,789

STEVENSON, DAVIS, MILLER & MOSHER, LLP

1615 L Street, N.W., Suite 850

Washington, D.C. 20036-5622

April 22, 2005

PNL:cb

202/785-0100